

August 23

came hard since few were given much encouragement to dig them out as was demonstrated on June 1, 1970, when lightning suddenly struck.

Angered by discovery of irregularities in Washington that FNS had ignored for months, a well-known newspaper serving a market of over a million readers opened an attack on administration laxity and charged FNS with silent complicity in the matter, simultaneously recalling earlier predictions that it would turn out to be "an American Tass."

The same bright young Government official (older now, and presumably more resourceful) was stung by this into recalling the half-forgotten proviso to the effect that FNS would be withdrawn from anyone "mis-handling" the news. He promptly invoked it.

The next day readers of this newspaper found it shorn of all international, national and even regional news. Having only a few reporters left (FNS was by then even reporting sports and theater news) it could present only a few scraps of local gossip and was obviously not long for this world.

This lesson was not lost on the rest of the press nor on radio and TV stations. After a cautious study of the ruin to which their excontemporary's brashness had brought him, they opted for the safety of conformity.

FNS thus survived unchallenged, except by a rather worrisome unofficial system all-too familiar to dictators. Known popularly as the grapevine, this proved an inexhaustible source of the wildest rumors. It upset everybody, perhaps most of all the administration itself, but continued to spread like wildfire despite the most relentless attempts to stamp it out.

Too True To Be Good

To some readers the American Tass [see above] may seem pure fantasy. In actual fact it's far from it.

The Department of Agriculture has already launched a wire service competitive with that of PAM News Corp. Its information is gathered at the taxpayer's expense then offered gratis to anyone who wants it and is willing to pay what it costs A.T. & T. to include them in its circuit and realize a small profit.

Since PAM, a commercial enterprise, must charge not only for the use of wires, operators, and tickers but for newsgathering costs that USDA charges off to the taxpayers, the result is intolerable pressure on the commercial service. Few forms of free enterprise can stand up for long under this type of competition.

How has this come about? And how was it that the Federal Communications Commission, which is usually so discriminating in specifying who should start this service or that and what the kiddies ought to be watching on TV, refused to do anything about it?

Let us get that out of the way first. When the American Newspapers Publishers' Association and PAM took the issue to FCC the Commission took one look at who wanted to offer the news service (USDA) and concluded that since it was a Federal agency the issue was "not cognizable by the Commission."

Well, I'm not going to indulge in the losing litigants time-honored right to "cuss the judge," but there are other aspects of the issue that I think you will find as disturbing as I do.

There follow pertinent paragraphs of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and PAM News Corp. and the decision of the FCC in connection therewith. A beautiful brochure has been printed and is being used by A.T. & T. salesmen to promote this service.

A background statement issued by the De-

partment of Agriculture says in one paragraph:

"According to USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, the new system will not bring in any revenue to the Federal Government, and will not result in any additional cost to the Federal Government."

And another paragraph:

"Under this plan, subscribers apply directly to the company that owns the teletype circuits, which handles all the work of contracts, billings, collections, etc., without cost or income to the Federal Government. The plan is designed to increase access to information, particularly to detailed specialized information, detail on local markets, and other information already being collected and summarized."

Two more paragraphs:

"The private common carrier that owns the teletype system leased by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been obligated to protect the confidentiality of information flowing over that system, until the information was released by the USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service."

"Therefore, it required written authorization to provide this extension of service to private subscribers. The idea was discussed of having the Agricultural Marketing Service approve each application. It was being rejected as being time-consuming and unnecessary. Instead, a catchall reservation of the right of the USDA to cancel service was included in the authorizing letter."

I wonder what a "catchall" reservation is?

A sentence in the next paragraph:

"Since it is impossible to foresee what illegal use or flagrant abuses might be made by individual subscribers, the reservation also includes the right to cancel service to individual subscribers."

I wonder who determines what "flagrant abuses" are?

Another sentence:

"In fact, even aside from the news media the USDA does not expect that it will be necessary to cancel service to any individual subscribers."

Isn't it nice to know that the USDA doesn't expect that it will be necessary to cancel service.

In a letter dated August 9, 1963, addressed to Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Mr. G. R. Grange, Deputy Administrator, Marketing Services says as follows:

"The PAM News Corp. relays to its customers Federal-State market news reports plus supplemental market information which it collects directly. Whether the direct connections to our leased wire circuit will adversely affect its business may depend on the value which its customers place on the supplemental information they receive from the PAM News Corp. Press associations, newspapers, radio and television stations, business firms, and all other interested persons may, if they desire, have access to the market news circuit. We have no basis for making it available to some and denying it to others, as long as there is no false or illegal use of the Federal-State market news reports."

As I remarked earlier, if you will weigh these words against the projections drawn in the American Tass, I don't think you'll find the latter overly fanciful. Perhaps you'll feel as I feel, recalling the title of one of Shaw's plays, "It Is Just Too True To Be Good."

(Mr. JOHANSEN (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. JOHANSEN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FAILURE OF THE HOUSE TO PASS
AIRTIGHT BAN ON AID TO COUNTRIES TRADING WITH CUBA, AS PROPOSED IN THE CRAMER AMENDMENT, WILL COME BACK TO HAUNT THE CONGRESS BECAUSE THE AMENDMENT PASSED LEAVES A GAPING LOOPHOLE

(Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, because of the misrepresented effect of the amendment banning aid to countries trading with Cuba, written into the foreign aid bill, H.R. 7885, just passed by the House, and because of the manner in which my amendment, putting teeth into this foreign aid ban was defeated by a tie vote of 162 to 162, and then only after the chairman in a seldom precedented action voted to create the teller tie, I believe it my duty to clarify the RECORD.

The amendment as passed is a meaningless, halfhearted attempt to give the public the impression that Congress is insisting on stopping aid to countries that trade with Cuba when this is not the case on the record.

The House had an opportunity to cut off aid to countries trading with Cuba by adopting my amendment to the Fascell-Rogers amendment.

In order to put the issue in focus, I reprint hereafter the Fascell-Rogers amendment as passed and my amendment which failed by a tie vote.

The Fascell-Rogers amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 10, strike out "graph;" and insert in lieu thereof "graphs:"

Page 14, line 10, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 10 insert the following:

"(3) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

"(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

"(1) any items of economic assistance,

"(2) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

"(3) any other equipment, materials, or commodities; and

"(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime."

My amendment added this sentence to the Fascell-Rogers amendment:

The restrictions contained in this section may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act or in any other provision of law.

Commission asking for suspension of the market news service inaugurated August 1 by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

There is serious question whether the U.S. Government has statutory authority to enter into the business of collecting and disseminating news in competition with private news agencies.

Deeply involved is the broad principle of a free press and the danger of censorship implicit in the Department's news service rules.

The service can be terminated by the USDA. The Department reserves the right to cancel at any time the connection of any and all subscribers who "abuse" the service by misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when in its sole judgment, such cancellation is desirable.

According to the ANPA this raises the possibility of censorship in its most odious form.

As newspaper publisher myself, I am especially concerned lest this become the first step toward an expanding role of Government in controlling the distribution of news.

I believe it would be in the public interest to ask responsible officials of the Department of Agriculture to appear before the Committee on Agriculture in public hearings to get the facts.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

Here is the text of a statement on this issue by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, dated July 25, 1963:

ANPA PETITIONS FCC TO SUSPEND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT MARKET NEWS SERVICE

ANPA filed a petition July 22 with the Federal Communications Commission asking for suspension of the market news service to be inaugurated August 1 by the U.S. Agriculture Department.

Specifically, petition calls for suspension or rejection of the new A.T. & T. tariff which establishes the service. All contracts for the service must be between the subscriber and A.T. & T., subject to Agriculture Department approval.

ANPA petition argues there is no statutory authority permitting the U.S. Government to enter the business of collecting and disseminating news, in competition with private news agencies. ANPA also maintains that the Government would be permitted to exercise censorship "in one of its most odious forms," since the Agriculture Department could deny the service to a subscriber at any time for alleged "misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when in its sole judgment such cancellation is desirable."

Petition was also filed in this matter July 22 by P.A.M. News Corp. (Ridder newspapers).

Text of ANPA petition follows:

"The American Newspaper Publishers Association (ANPA), 750 Third Avenue, New York 17, N.Y., pursuant to the provisions of 1,463 of the rules, hereby petitions the Commission to suspend and set for hearing or reject seventh revised page 41 of A.T. & T. Tariff FCC No. 208, published to become effective August 1, 1963.

"In support whereof, petitioner states:

"1. The above-named page, effective August 1, 1963, was filed under A.T. & T. Transmittal No. 7576, dated July 1, 1963, which states:

"This filing is being made in compliance with the decision and orders of the Federal Communications Commission adopted January 28, 1963, FCC 63-66 (34 FCC 217) and May 27, 1963, FCC 63-491 (34 FCC 1004) in dockets Nos. 11645 and 11646."

"2. However, this particular tariff page was not filed to comply with any decision or order of the Commission but was filed to establish for the first time an entirely new type of service not heretofore furnished.

"3. On May 20 and July 10, 1963, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced the

establishment of a New Market News Service and a copy of these two announcements are attached hereto as attachments A and B. Also, the Department of Agriculture recently issued a bulletin describing the new service more fully and a copy of this bulletin (AMS 510) entitled 'A New Market News Service' is attached as attachment C. It is this New Market News Service that the new A.T. & T. tariff page purports to establish although this fact is not disclosed in the A.T. & T. transmittal letter as should have been done under the Commission's rules (sec. 61.33).

"4. Petitioner requests that this new tariff page be suspended or rejected.

"5. This is a new venture of the U.S. Government into the business of collecting and disseminating news in competition with private news agencies. Petitioner knows of no statutory authority by which the U.S. Department of Agriculture may expend Federal tax funds for this purpose.

"6. The highly improper nature of the new service is characterized by the following conditions imposed upon the service:

SERVICE CAN BE TERMINATED BY USDA

The new service is available to all who want it, and no application need be made to USDA to receive service. However, USDA reserves the right to cancel at any time the connection of any and all subscribers who abuse the service by misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when, in its sole judgment, such cancellation is desirable. (See p. 4 of attachment C.)

"7. This provision would permit U.S. Government censorship in one of its most odious forms. Any newspaper seeking to subscribe to this new service could be denied service for any reason. Any newspaper already subscribing could have its service canceled without notice or reason. Editorials written by a newspaper that the Department of Agriculture didn't like would, under the above-quoted provision be grounds for denial or cancellation of service.

"8. Thus, this news service has transcendent importance. If it is not halted now, it could lead to further ambitious attempts by this and other U.S. Government agencies to expand and enter into competition with private news agencies. An expansion of this concept would result in a government-controlled news service such as presently exists in some other countries including the Soviet Union, where the so-called news service Tass is government owned and operated.

"9. The tariff violates sections 201, 202, and 214 of the act and section 61.69(b) of the rules reading as follows:

"(b) When tariffs or supplements are issued on less than statutory notice, under permission, decision, order or regulation of the Commission, strict compliance with all conditions named therein and all rules and regulations of the Commission not expressly waived will be required; otherwise they will be rejected."

Wherefore petitioner requests the Commission either to suspend or reject the tariff page referred to above.

Here is a comment on this problem as it appeared in the August 19 Journal of Commerce:

THE AMERICAN TASS

(By Eric Ridder)

What gets me—now that we're well into the 1970's and I look back ruefully at the past decade—is that it only took 5 years to kill the independent American press and that the execution was carried out with such a minimum of malice.

It really came to a head in 1965 (get the date, 1965) when the major Federal departments decided at a Washington meeting to establish a single wire service for the rapid collection and interdepartmental dissemination of current information in widely scattered fields. There was, after all, a certain

logic to it. Quite a number of agencies had been collecting their own information for years. Why shouldn't all these activities be combined into one giant circuit?

They were, and in no time at all a large assemblage of reporters, teletype operators and other personnel was woven into a wire system slightly larger than the combined networks of the Associated Press and United Press International. There were some growing pains at first, but by 1967 it was plain that the new Federal News Service (FNS) was second to none, its coverage then extending into stock prices, business annual reports, and (seemingly for the enlightenment of the Department of Justice) even into homicide and other local police matters.

The Service grew so rapidly that it was virtually inevitable that before 1967 was out a bright and highly influential young Government official should suggest, first to the Bureau of the Budget and then to Congress, that "this service is being provided with the taxpayers' money and should be made available to anyone who is willing to pay for it and will not abuse the use of it."

The proposition was promptly challenged as a move to set up "an American Tass" (a reference to the Soviet Government's news service monopoly). AP and UPI objected strenuously that it constituted an unwarranted interference with free enterprise.

But these objections got nowhere. The stage had been already been set back in the summer of 1963 when the Department of Agriculture offered a crop and market reporting service to anyone willing to pay A.T. & T. a rate for the wire service sufficient to return the company a profit. This, too, had been challenged, among others by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, for it was plain that the probable effect of this would be to put a commercial service in the same field (the PAM News Corp.) out of business. USDA had been quite unmoved by this eventuality. So was the Federal Communications Commission. When it saw that another Federal agency had been named respondent in the publishers' petition it backed off at once with the explanation that propriety of USDA's wire service to non-Government individuals was "not cognizable by the Commission."

So the point was made and carried in 1965 that if any fight were to be won on the subject, it should have been won in 1963 when the issue first came out into the open in earnest. Moreover, there had been other precedents in the field of electric power. As in the USDA case earlier, the Government then went ahead and arranged with A.T. & T. to distribute its service to anyone who would pay for it and not mishandle the news. Billings and collections would be up to A.T. & T. itself. The Government sincerely hoped that private news services would not suffer, but left the plain implication that if they did, it was their own hard luck.

A pause followed and lasted until certain newspaper and broadcasting media, struggling hard for survival, cancelled their regular news service contracts and subscribed to FNS, which offered lower rates.

The effect of this was to reduce the funds available to the private wire service. As the quality and scope of their services began to decline the whole thing began to snowball. By 1969 both AP and UPI were out of business. Though somewhat bewildered at first by the swiftness of these events, FNS found itself a monopoly.

Like BBC in England, FNS tried to be objective. It was, up to a point, but there were times (especially during elections years) when it could not quite forget which side of its bread the butter was on. Administration critics got rather short shrift. Scandals involving the administration went largely unreported because they did not quite qualify as constructive news. Some editors learned of them and reacted vigorously, but the facts

It is obvious from a careful analysis of the action of the House in refusing my amendment and passing the watered-down aid ban amendment of Fascell-Rogers, that the House in effect did nothing that is not already accomplished under present law.

Under present law, the President has discretion to cut off or withhold aid to any country if he determines it to be "in the national interest"—for whatever reason he and the State Department decide. This is inherent in the aid program. It is specifically spelled out under section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Section 614 specifically provides:

The President may authorize in each fiscal year the use of funds made available for use under this Act—when the President determines that such authorization is important to the security of the United States.

Thus, it is obvious that the President can waive the provisions of the Fascell-Rogers amendment and permit aid to go to countries when he cares to so exercise that discretion.

As a matter of fact, that is the loophole that has resulted in 50 percent of the ships going to Cuba to continue to be free world ships. The President used section 614 to get around the amendment—similar to the Fascell-Rogers amendment, passed in the fiscal 1962 foreign aid appropriations bill—to even permit Greece to ship oil to Cuba.

Thus, my amendment was to make the aid ban on countries trading with Cuba mandatory, because the experience under the 1962 ban—similar to the Fascell-Rogers ban—proved that the President and the State Department would exercise their discretion to waive that amendment under section 614 in a manner that defeated the purpose of the amendment.

My amendment would have removed the discretion contained in section 614 and thus make such a ban airtight. This is the only way to stop trading with Cuba by friendly foreign aid recipient nations.

I think the House missed its only real opportunity to cut off such trade when it failed to pass my amendment. I shall be watching with special interest the trading that continues between Cuba and foreign aid recipients in 1963 and 1964 under the watered-down Fascell-Rogers amendment, which I believe will be the final and clinching proof of my position.

WHERE ARE COMMUNISTS ON THE RUN?

(Mr. SCHADEBERG (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have listened intently to the entire debate on the Foreign Assistance Act and the one major argument given time and time again was that we needed to pass this bill in order to prevent the spread of communism. The argument was substantiated even by the suggestion that we now have the Communists on the run. Had not there been so much talk on the bill which I feared might make the debate on this \$4½ billion bill—a

most serious matter for the taxpayers who must pay for it—a circus rather than the important consideration it is, I would have asked time during the debate to ask for some evidence to substantiate the argument.

I might ask just where are the Communists on the run?

In Cuba, with missiles in place to protect the Communist government of Castro from those who, loving freedom, want to take back the country stolen from them?

In Cuba where there is in process the building of a submarine base?

In Cuba which has been turned into a Western Hemisphere base for subversion schools and propaganda mills, munition depots and radar monitoring stations?

In Venezuela where terrorism and sabotage are on the increase?

In British Guiana where the first Communist foothold on the Latin American Continent is forming?

In Laos where Averell Harriman's troika regime is pulling the country straight down the drain for a Communist takeover?

In Korea where the "truce" is broken from time to time?

In Berlin where the wall is daily beefed up and Communist guards still shoot unarmed civilians?

On the high seas where our military forces trace the movement of freedom fighters to head them off before touching their native soil they desire to reclaim?

In Russia and East Europe where thousands of Congolese and other Africans are being trained for the next round of rebellion in Africa?

In Yemen where Soviet engineers are rolling out an airstrip on a staging point for Africa and points west?

In Africa's Golden Horn where Soviet experts are building a new port for Soviet trawlers submarines and warships?

In the United States where Gus Hall and his tribes infiltrate the campuses of our Nation's universities and the Communist Party announces, as top priority, its effort to increase racial turmoil and violence both North and South?

In Haiti where the pot is boiling with increased ferocity?

All this after spending nearly \$110 billion in 18 years for foreign aid to fight communism.

The argument that we need the foreign aid program to combat communism would have more merit if part of the money that has been requested had not gone into the support of Communist countries which are part of the bloc against which we are waging the cold war.

It would have more merit if our present foreign policy was not one of accommodation and appeasement, for the purpose—using the President's own words—"to make the world safe for diversity," which simply means to make the world safe for communism—coexistence on an equal basis.

It would have more merit if our military policy was not one which is built on the premise that in order to keep the peace we must have a nuclear stale-

mate, for example, disarm ourselves down to the level of the enemy.

The argument would have more merit if we had not abandoned the Monroe Doctrine and helped dig the grave in which we buried it.

I make one other observation. The argument that we must be humanitarian and thus continue this multibillion-dollar gift business, lacks respect for the will of the people as to how their money for aid should be spent.

In the hearing before the subcommittee a representative of a large church body—I will not mention either his name or the name of the denomination in whose behalf he allegedly appeared since I am sure he did not appear for this lobby purpose as a result of the direct vote of the members of its respective denomination—testified upon questioning that the giving of his denomination for foreign aid—foreign mission—averaged out to \$1.50 per member per year. This is what people voluntarily gave. This bill represented a request for foreign aid amounting to \$100 for every family of four—not a voluntary but a mandatory gift which they would be forced to give because the Government would tax them for it. Can we justify forcing our citizens to participate in a giving for foreign aid purposes and this to the tune of \$25 a year for every member of the family, large or small?

ONE-MILLIONTH CARLOAD OF LETTUCE SHIPPED FROM SALINAS VALLEY, CALIF.

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include a newspaper article.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this week the Salinas Valley shipped its millionth carload—railroad carload—of head lettuce. This is a lot of lettuce. It means a lot of things to many people. It is only one of many fresh fruit and vegetable crops grown in, and shipped from the Salinas Valley. It has helped to provide a bountiful sustenance for many persons throughout the United States—most of the produce is shipped to the Eastern States. It has provided many good jobs for many thousands of persons of all skill levels, callings, trades and professions throughout the United States. It has contributed more to the raising of the standard of living of as many people as any other industry.

The obligation of helping to feed the United States, and much of the world, will continue. We are proud of our record. We are anxious to discharge our obligation even better.

Needless to say the abrupt discontinuance of the bracero method for providing the necessary supplemental labor to harvest crops will cause chaos and disruption to this small but important and productive industry.

I share the following newspaper article from the Salinas Californian with my colleagues primarily to acquaint them with the importance of this industry to the residents of every congressional district in the United States.

MILESTONE IN LETTUCE IS REACHED

The one-millionth carload of lettuce rolled out of the Salinas Valley this morning, bedecked with bunting and loaded with produce representing some 400 Salinas Valley growers.

Each of the lettuce cartons is carefully wrapped in foil, and bound for New York where it will be sold in a special auction, with the proceeds going to the American Red Cross.

The iceberg lettuce was donated by members of the Growers Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California, which represents growers in the Monterey-Santa Cruz-San Benito County areas.

The millionth car was launched on its way by Charles Paul, director of the California Department of Agriculture; members of the California State Legislature, and other dignitaries, including Pamela Gamble, last year's Miss California.

IMPORTANT MILESTONE

At the brief but historic ceremony, the shipment of the millionth car was hailed as an important milestone by J. J. Crosetti, president of the Grower-Shipper Association.

Crosetti said: "The Salinas Valley today typifies the important role which all of California's agricultural areas play in the lives of every man, woman, and child in the United States."

He added that, "from California's comparatively limited valleys and foothills, containing less than 3 percent of the Nation's farms, our State's growers provide over 42 percent of the Nation's fruits and nuts; 43 percent of the Nation's vegetables and over 25 percent of the entire Nation's supply of food."

FIRST SHIPMENT RECALLED

Today's 1,000,000th carload in the ultra-modern PFE mechanical reefer was a far cry from the first shipment of iced lettuce which left the Salinas Valley in 1921. A shipment which ended in disaster when the car ran out of ice before it reached its destination.

The very chore of icing that first car gave birth to an anecdote still going around Salinas. It is said the growers' order for 10 cakes of ice was doubted by the owner of the local iceplant. He thought the order must have meant 10 pounds, and insisted upon seeing the car before delivering the ice.

Within a few years, however, there were no doubts about the demands on ice production. Before the advent of mechanical vacuum coolers, Salinas made and used more ice than the city of New York.

NEW RECORD SET

By 1937, the district shipped 28,000 cars to set a new record for shipments from one district in one season. By the early fifties, these shipments had grown to 40,000 cars a year.

Although the area is a major producer of other vegetables, having shipped to date over 150,000 cars of mixed vegetables with no less than 50 different varieties in a single car, lettuce is still king. And though today, shipments from Salinas must share the market with many new growing areas, the Salad Bowl of the World still accounts for 40 percent of the Nation's lettuce with about 85 percent of its shipments going out of State.

Jack Blas, executive vice president of the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association, summarized it all very nicely as he watched the millionth carload move out of the railroad yards on its way to New York.

"That carload represents more than the 999,999 cars which have preceded it," he said. "It represents the economy of this area, the economy of California's millions of jobs and the major source of food for even more millions of Americans. It symbolizes

something that all of us should be very proud to be a part of. For it represents California agriculture which . . . even in this world of rockets and space technology . . . is still our No. 1 industry."

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 78

(Mr. GONZALEZ was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a major struggle has developed on the question of once again extending Public Law 78, which permits Mexican nationals to enter this country to perform agricultural labor on a seasonal basis.

Long before coming here, I felt that the bracero program was wrong—the moral concept was wrong, and the impact it had on American agricultural workers was wrong.

My efforts against extension of the bracero law began with the hearings on H.R. 2009, a bill that this House defeated on May 29 by a vote of 154 to 178. Shortly thereafter, the Senate was given S. 1703, a bill exactly like H.R. 2009, except that it provided for a 1-year extension of Public Law 78. This month, that bill passed the Senate, but only after it had been amended so that domestic workers are guaranteed the same conditions as Mexican nationals. The House will get S. 1703, but without that amendment. I hope that this House will again defeat extension of Public Law 78, despite the heavy lobbying effort now being exerted in its behalf. For this law is a shameful piece of legislation, a blight on our conscience—it is a disgrace which we have once rejected, and are now called upon to reject again. Let us confirm our judgment that no good can come from a law which is unjust.

(Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KASTENMEIER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MOORHEAD (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOORHEAD'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. RYAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record in three instances.)

[Mr. RYAN of Michigan's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

[Mr. RYAN of Michigan's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

[Mr. RYAN of Michigan's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it has been an amazing thing to watch the complete smear and distortion job which has been done by liberal news media on the Young Republican National Convention which was held in San Francisco, June 25-28, 1963. It is of course to be expected because there are bad tidings at home for the pseudoliberal element in contemporary politics. Harbingers of change are evident everywhere and the liberals just cannot get used to it, whether they be liberals in the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. In truth, it is amazing to see how similar the tactics are for those who profess to be Republicans and their liberal counterparts in the other party. You can read what Governor Rockefeller, the ADA, the official Democratic newspaper, Drew Pearson, former Young Republican Chairman Len Nadasdy, and the AFL-CIO are saying without changing the copy. It carries the same tune all of the way through.

Charges have been hurled which need to be answered. The record should be set straight. To be fair, it must be admitted that the non-Republican liberal community has received grist for their propaganda mills through the irresponsible statements of GOP spokesmen who should know better such as the Governor of New York and former Chairman Nadasdy. It has been alleged that radicals took over the Young Republican movement. The tactics of these unknown radicals have been depicted as roughshod, totalitarian, Birch inspired and controlled, fantastic—well, just about every extreme adjective which can be imagined. Pleas of unity have scattered to the winds. This buttresses the opinions I have had for many years. As long as the minority liberal faction in the Republican Party can either run things or have disproportionate voice, unity is fine. If the overwhelming conservative majority ever appears to exert its rightful voice and looks like it might have its say, unity goes to the winds and the liberal element attacks its own with all of the passion of the opposition party.

Chairman Donald "Buz" Lukens, our new YR National Chairman, has been singled out for particular attack. Of course, he was not supposed to win and it did create a traumatic experience for those who were preparing to toast the supposed winner. Chairman Nadasdy, in fact, told reporters he was "in a state of shock." In Nadasdy's case, it can't be said that his shock moved him to make unfortunate utterances on the spur of the moment which he would now regret. In his particular case, he had been using the old scare technique line even before the convention so his regrettable and untrue charges in the post-convention period were out of the same cloth. Newspaper reports from his native State of Minnesota carried his "grave" warnings about the dangers